

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 17 and 18 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12 and 14-26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE WITH EXAMINER:

On August 23, 2006, Examiner Vicky Johnson and Applicant's attorney Darleen J. Stockley held a telephone interview about claims 13 and 16. Examiner Johnson confirmed that claim 13 was cancelled and said that claim 16 should be listed as objected to. Applicant thanks the Examiner for clarifying the status of claim 16.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 3, claims 17-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claims 17 and 18 have been amended to recite "An image forming apparatus..." and to indicate more clearly that the image forming apparatus comprises a pulley fixing apparatus. Applicant respectfully submits that amended claims 17 and 18 are now definite and in allowable form under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

In the Office Action, at pages 3-4, numbered paragraph 5, claims 1-3, 5-8, 14, 15, 19, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ford (USPN 3,413,866; hereafter, Ford). This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Ford differs from independent claims 1, 19, 25 and 16 of the present invention at least due to a different construction or arrangement of the pulley. That is, Ford discusses an idler pulley at col. 2, lines 63-68:

An internally threaded boss 23 is welded to the outer end of the member 22 to threadedly receive the inner end of a bolt 24 which functions as a shaft for an idler pulley 25, a spacer sleeve 26 being arranged on the bolt 24 between the pulley 25 and the boss 23, as best shown in FIGURES 5 and 6. (emphasis added)

That is, Ford recites an extensible mounting for an idler pulley engagable with a belt. In contrast, independent claims 1, 19, 25 and 26 of the present invention provide a pulley fixing apparatus wherein the pulley fixing part fixes a driven pulley.

Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1, 19, 25 and 26 of the present invention are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Ford (USPN 3,413,866). Since claims 2-3, 5-8, 14, and 15 depend from claim 1, claims 2-3, 5-8, 14, and 15 of the present invention are not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Ford (USPN 3,413,866) for at least the reasons claim 1 is not anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Ford (USPN 3,413,866).

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

A. In the Office Action, at pages 5-6, numbered paragraph 7, claims 4 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford (USPN 3,413,866; hereafter, Ford) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859; hereafter, Holbrook). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As noted above, Ford does not teach or suggest a pulley fixing apparatus wherein the pulley fixing part fixes a driven pulley.

Holbrook also does does not teach or suggest a pulley fixing apparatus wherein the pulley fixing part fixes a driven pulley.

Hence, even if the Ford invention were to be modified using Holbrook's first, second, third and fourth slide protrusions, the combination of Ford and Holbrook would not teach or suggest the pulley fixing apparatus of independent claims 1 and 20 wherein the pulley fixing part fixes a driven pulley. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 and 19 of the present invention are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ford (USPN 3,413,866) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859).

Since claims 4 and 20 depend from claims 1 and 19, respectively, claims 4 and 20 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ford (USPN 3,413,866) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859) for at least the reasons claims 1 and 19 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ford (USPN 3,413,866) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859).

B. In the Office Action, at pages 6-7, numbered paragraph 8, claims 21-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Ford (USPN 3,413,866; hereafter, Ford) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859; hereafter, Holbrook) and Burgoon (USPN 5,141,083; hereafter, Burgoon). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

As noted above, neither Ford nor Holbrook teaches or suggests a pulley fixing apparatus wherein the pulley fixing part fixes a driven pulley.

Burgoon teaches a brake pad assembly for a disc braking system wherein protrusions extend upwardly therefrom with irregular surfaces and a composite brake pad molded in situ onto the braking plate, the composite material of the pad encapsulating the protrusions so that upon thermal expansion during use, the pad will not separate from the backing plate (see Abstract, Burgoon). There is no teaching or suggestion that there is thermal expansion during use of the pulley fixing apparatus for an image forming apparatus of claim 19 of the present invention. It is also suggested that there is no teaching or suggestion of combining a brake pad for a disk brake system with a pulley fixing apparatus for an image forming apparatus.

At least since neither Ford nor Holbrook teaches or suggests a pulley fixing apparatus wherein the pulley fixing part fixes a driven pulley, even if combined, Ford, Holbrook and Burgoon do not teach or suggest claim 19 of the present invention. Hence, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 of the present invention is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ford (USPN 3,413,866) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859) and Burgoon (USPN 5,141,083).

Since claims 21-24 depend from claim 19, claims 21-24 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ford (USPN 3,413,866) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859) and Burgoon (USPN 5,141,083) for at least the reasons claim 19 is patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ford (USPN 3,413,866) in view of Holbrook (USPN 4,969,859) and Burgoon (USPN 5,141,083).

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

In the Office Action, at page 7, numbered paragraph 9, claims 9-12 and 16 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. (Since the Office Action did not mention claim 16 specifically, we called the Examiner on August 23, 2006 and were told that claim 16 was also objected to.)

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her careful review of the claims.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: September 29, 2006 By: Darleen J. Stockley
Darleen J. Stockley
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501